

***Note: These minutes are a draft and are not to be considered official until approved at the next meeting.***

**Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting  
Tuesday, June 10, 2015  
West Des Moines City Council Chambers  
West Des Moines, Iowa**

**Call to Order**

Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steven P. Ray at 9:00 a.m. A quorum was determined from the roll call as indicated below.

**Roll Call**

	Representative	Attendance
Iowa Association of Public Safety Communications Officers (APCO) <b>Secretary</b>	Sally Hall	Present
alternate	Cara Sorrells	
Iowa Chapter of the National Emergency Number Association (NENA)	Kirk Hundertmark	Excused
alternate	Rob Koppert	Present
Iowa State Sheriffs & Deputies Association (ISSDA)	Robert Rotter	Present
alternate	Dean Kruger	
Iowa Peace Officers Association (IPO)	George Griffith	Present
alternate	Sandy Morris	Present
Iowa Professional Firefighters (IAPFF)	Mike S. Bryant	Present
alternate	Doug Neys	
Iowa Firefighters Association (IFA)	Mark Murphy	Absent
alternate	Tom Berger	Absent
Iowa Emergency Managers Association (IEMA) <b>Vice-Chairperson</b>	Bob Seivert	Present
alternate	Jo Duckworth	
Iowa Department of Public Safety (IDPS) <b>Chairperson</b>	Steven P. Ray	Present
alternate	Adam Buck	
Iowa Emergency Medical Services Association (IEMSA)	Rob Dehnert	Present
alternate	Paul Andorf	
Iowa Telephone Association <15,000	Daniel Nichols	Present
alternate	Pat Snyder	
Iowa Telephone Association >15,000	Dan Halterman	Excused
alternate	Wayne Johnson	Present
Cellular Providers	Steve Zimmer	Absent
alternate	Bill Tortoriello	Excused
PCS Providers	David Kaus	Present
alternate	Joe Sargent	
Auditor of the State, Ex-Officio member	Warren Jenkins	Absent
 Staff:		
Blake DeRouchey, E-911 Program Manager		Present

**Guests:**

John Benson, HSEMD	Dena McKenna, Story County Sheriff's Office
Connie Hambly, Story County E911	Sarah McClure, Ames PD
Josh Halterman, DOT-TraCS/MACH	Stacen Gross, GeoComm
Duane Vos, Racom	Terry Brennan, Racom
Randy Frazier, Mahaska County E911	Diane Sefrit, SCI
Brent Long, Polk County Sheriff's Office	Lindsey Mosher, HSEMD
Doug McCasland, Warren County E911	Terry McClannahan, Dallas Co. Sheriff's Comm.
Mark Dayton, ICN	Tammy Rodriguez, ICN
Laurie Hickok, TCS	Craig Allen, SWIC
Randy Goddard, HSEMD	Butch Hancock, CenturyLink

James Lundsted, DHS/NPPD/OEC

### **Introductions**

Chairperson Steven P. Ray welcomed everyone. Board members and those in attendance introduced themselves.

### **Approve the Minutes**

Motion by Kaus, seconded by Johnson to approve the minutes of the May 13, 2015 meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

### **Approve the Agenda**

Motion by Kaus, seconded by Johnson to approve the agenda. All ayes. Motion passed.

### **State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Blake DeRouchey)**

#### **911 Program Financial Reports**

Mr. DeRouchey reported that seven out of the thirteen secondary ESINet PSAPs have been completed and six PSAPs are now Text to 911 capable. The most recent county added was Jackson.

An email was sent out Monday to approximately forty PSAP regarding their carryover grants that are still open. The PSAPs were reminded that the fiscal year is will be closing in about three weeks. The total for these grants is \$3 million.

A draft copy of the grant application for FYE 2016 was sent out to the board for review and comment. It includes a list of equipment that is now allowable based on the Iowa Code. Other changes were made. (i.e. drop downs, wording changes) The application will basically look the same.

Mike Bryant came 9:04

This will be for the traditional carryover grant and the GIS specific carryover grant. The applications are separate but will look very similar. Service boards will be able to apply for the GIS carryover grant based on the number of PSAPs they have. For example if Polk County wanted to apply for all three PSAPs in one application, they can do that on the GIS carryover grant application.

The Legislature passed HF651 that will affect the PSAPs in the amount of surcharge that will be passed through. The percentage rate was increased from 46 to 58. A spreadsheet of those numbers was distributed that showed a comparison of the 46% and 58% by quarter and annually. This was based on the first calendar quarter figures. PSAPs will see the increase with the October payment. The July payment will still be at 46%. About \$3 million extra will be passed through to the PSAPs. That will still be based on call counts and square mileage of the PSAP's service area.

There was discussion on the payment for Public Safety being less. Mr. DeRouchey will recheck those figures.

Mr. DeRouchey stated that he would like to have the updated grant applications out by June 29<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Seivert – After yesterday's conversation about the radios and P25 is that something that needs to be clarified in the acceptable guidelines? Radios should at least be capable or programmable.

Mr. DeRouchey – Right now radios are listed as acceptable. In the draft copy of the carryover grant application I hadn't yet specified that but we can have the discussion.

Mr. Seivert – I feel that was the direction we were headed and that would facilitate that. I believe it would be appropriate to require radios purchased with the carryover grant funds be at least capable of being upgradable to P25.

Ms. Morris – Capable I have no problem with. I didn't want them to have to be P25 enabled to get a carryover grant.

Mr. Kaus – Why didn't you want it?

Ms. Morris – I think what Bob was saying originally the agency had to be P25 enabled to get radios with the carryover grant funds. He, I believe I understand, that he wants the requirement that to purchase radios they need to be P25 capable and I think that is absolutely fine.

Mr. Bryant – Dave your question was "Why". What I understood from the conversation why not enabled because the cost is so high for a small area that could not afford so many radios.

Mr. Kaus – I was going back to the meetings that we had at STARC. P25 was discussed at length. We wanted to have it as a mandate. We felt at the time P25 enabled radios across the state and in order to be interoperable.

Ms. Morris – I think the requirement of P25 capable is definitely a move towards that. To allow it to be capable instead of enabled will allow agencies to phase in P25 equipment. I hate to say you can't get a carryover grant to fund buying P25 equipment because all of your equipment is not P25. But if we say as long as you are buying P25 capable equipment and moving towards being P25 enabled then you can get the carryover grant funds. Because \$100,000 is not enough for agencies to move from not being P25 to being P25 enabled. Many agencies are going to have to phase in that equipment. So if they can get \$100,000 this year and \$100,000 next year and start phasing that equipment in. That is a way to eventually be all P25.

Mr. Dehnert – I think the other issues is...I certainly agree with the spirit of requiring P25 equipment but there are a number of conventional analog paging systems that are out there still and will likely be out there for a very long time. Some of the interoperable systems that are analog, I don't see the future of them going P25 anytime soon. I just wonder if you really get pigeonholed into everything needs to be P25. There is still a lot of analog stuff out there.

Mr. Kaus – I guess the way I look at it is any equipment that's still analog and spend the option part...my opinion is in most cases why spend money if it is working fine. In order to keep up with technology, they are going to have to do something. Either that or put a timeline on it. The FCC issued the notice for narrowbanding ten years before the mandated date. It is easy to put it aside and procrastinate.

Sheriff Rotter – It is important to remember that there's a lot of small fire departments and QRS agencies that cannot sell enough pancakes to buy those radios and that's just a reality they live in and to mandate enabled radios would literally put them out of business. I've got several that couldn't begin to buy P25 enabled radios. Not today. Now in a few years as that technology expands and the prices come down – I think they will be like any other radio. I think that is going to have to happen for a lot of them.

Mr. Koppert – My concern is there are a number of entities that are using not P25 but they may be using MotoTurbo. I know one county is using NexEdge from Kenwood. They are digital too. Granted they don't meet the national interoperable standard. They are proprietary digital. That was their choice to go that route. I don't think we need to exclude those either. While I am pro P25 I don't think we can limit it to P25.

Mr. Bryant – We talked about making this restriction on the carryover grant funds but you have the surcharge. You can say that's what it's going to be for but that's probably an Administrative Rules thing or maybe more of a Code thing. If we are going to tell them specifically what kind of radio they have to buy with wireless surcharge. You buy whatever you want with the surcharge and the other stuff you're your carryover. I agree with the spirit, if we don't start some place.....

Chair Ray – The need for P25 is going to drive itself. The legislation opened up the wireless carryover a little broader. Now we are going to come back and say we are going to clamp it down on one thing.

Mr. Allen – For those that use radios that are not P25 at least capable. What does their future look like when they look to this group for direction? At least requiring the P25 capable you give them an option to move forward to come back and say we have twelve radios that we have bought over five years and we would like to use some of our surcharge money to make them P25 capable and put them on a P25 system. And maybe it's not their system. Maybe it's their neighbor's system. The standard piece of this is at the national level it's overwhelming. We are getting ready to be standardized in so many ways on so many technologies. LTE and conversations on encryption. Today this group is being looked to, to make sure they don't squander their money. To buy stuff five to ten years from now, it won't work on the technology available. They do look to Interop Board and this board. If they want to spend their money on what they want that's fine but money from here it totally should be aligned with that greater good of the state. Rob can a P25 radio, because there are so many manufacturers, operate on any of those networks? Can it operate MotoTurbo? Can it be slaved by channel? What about the other type of digital technology?

Mr. Koppert – It is my understanding MotoTurbo and NexEdge are proprietary digital formats. There are also others out there too. You have Tetra which is European but it is making some inroads in the United States too. I don't think you can make a MotoTurbo talk on NexEdge or a P25 talk on a NexEdge or a P25 talk on a MotoTurbo or vice versa. Am I correct Terry (Brennan)?

Mr. Brennan – You are correct. All radios have analog capability. You can always go to an analog conventional mode. The only other thing I would add that if you buy a radio that's P25 ready and enabled versus capable you are probably looking at an extra cost of \$200. Which could increase the price of the radio 10 to 30% or more. So if you require P25 ready then an agency is potentially spending more money for the radios than they need to. Instead, P25 capable means they would be able to add it later if or when needed. to be able to use it but they ought to be able to add it later when needed.

Mr. Koppert – That also brought up what is the definition between ready and capable? We bought several radios that didn't have P25 flashed in them but once flashed in they are P25 capable. Doesn't that mean that they have to have that P25 flashed into them or does it mean that they can be....have that P25 flashed into them? That is something that really needs to be discussed too. What is the definition of P25 ready radio?

Mr. Allen – Does it differ from manufacturer to manufacturer? It's a software flash, right?

Mr. Brennan – You could say it is P25 software upgradable.

Ms. Morris – And the only restriction would be on the radio? You could still use your carryover grant money for recorders as long as they are i3.

Mr. Allen – I applaud the effort that you are driving for a standard. What happens is that it makes that stuff much more elegant down life's the road.

Motion by Seivert, seconded by Bryant that when the wireless carryover grant fund is used for radio equipment purchases that said radio equipment must be P25 software upgradable. All ayes. Motion passed.

Mr. DeRouchey – I had a chance to review the figures for DPS and they did add up correctly.

#### Wireless Carryover Fund PSAP Application Approvals

Polk County – Westcom – Eventide Logging Recorder, Anritsu System Analyzer, Communications Desksets, Communications Interoperability Gateway and Communications System Status Monitoring upgrade. Grant request of \$98,978.62. Motion by Kaus, seconded by Koppert to recommend approval. All ayes except Dehnert abstained. Motion passed.

Benton County – Upgrade recording system to DDS Corporation system. Grant request of \$11,031.55. Motion by Kaus, seconded by Koppert to recommend approval. All ayes. Motion passed.

## **Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees**

### **Technical Advisory – Dave Kaus**

Nothing to report.

### **Legislative Updates – Vice Chair Bob Seivert**

HF651 passed in both chambers. The final bill had a onetime allocation of \$4 million to help fund the 700 MHz radio system. Surcharge pass through was raised from 46 to 58%, \$100,000 set aside for development of public awareness and educational programs related to the use of 911 by the public, educational programs for personnel responsible for the maintenance, operation, and upgrading of local E911 systems, and the expenses of members of the E911 communications council for travel, monthly meetings, and training. One of the things that most sufficiently affects the PSAPs is the wireless carryover fund can be used for the receipt and disposition of the call. Your radios equipment, towers and repeaters are now all eligible for that wireless carryover amount. The allocation to the wireless carriers for cost recovery to deliver E911 phase 1 services was extended an additional ten years but the percentage amount was lowered from 13 to 10% but they are only using 2%. There is a three year incentive for PSAPs that consolidate of a 25% increase in the wireless surcharge allocation for those PSAPs.

I would encourage the associations that sit around this table to collaborate efforts for next year. The 700 MHz radio system funding will rise to the top of the pile I am certain. We need to be aware of that and have a coordinated plan which is better than each of our associations being fragmented. I would encourage that a coalition be developed over the summer to bring forward the needs of the PSAPs. Make sure the wireless surcharge money is brought back to the local level where it belongs.

Mr. Bryant – This was a compromise for this year and this session. This will be subject for consideration again next year. The majority of legislators that I spoke to...it seems as though I am doing more battle with Republicans on the House side and the Democrats in the Senate. The original House bill didn't include using any funding for the 700 MHz radio system. This was put in by the Senate. Rep. Worthan's statement regarding consolidation was "Could we do it with one PSAP?" You might be able to but do we want to do that. How was the 25% consolidation incentive figure selected? Per Rep. Worthan you had to start some place. I rather have it a voluntary incentive than mandated. This is something we may have to look at. It may have to be more. In my opinion it will. From what I have been told consolidation costs more the first few years and the in future you realize some savings. There will be a discussion about the two year study. What are the dates?

Mr. DeRouchey – January 1<sup>st</sup>.

Mr. Bryant – So we will not have time to plan ahead for the legislative session. Whatever we get in January we will have to work fast. A lot of the legislators want numbers. Things they can measure. That's what they kept falling back on. We are going to have results of this two year study next year so let's not get too far one way or the other this year. Rep. Worthan also said there is going to have to be a hard look at and I am going to guess this is going to be different for every big metropolitan, small densely populated counties to those midsize counties but there is going to have to be a hard look at...the philosophical question is how much of the PSAP should be paid for by property tax and what percentage should be paid by surcharge. I'm just telling you what battles, what discussions we need to be ready for. We need to have some general ideas as this year winds down.

Mr. DeRouchey – The numbers have been submitted and compiled. Part of the legislation includes an audit of those numbers. They are going to be getting in contact with a sample of those counties – same size counties – and validate those numbers. Probably by the end of July. During our meeting with the auditors, we don't want that to be a punitive type audit but we want the numbers to be right especially since this is the first time we have done this. Just trying to figure out how different counties got to that end number is basically what the audit is looking at.

Mr. Bryant – And I appreciate that. I sit on the Fire Service Emergency Response Council and I sit down once or twice a year and review the revolving loans to volunteer fire department and to municipalities. And part of the requirement is three year financials from the fire departments....or how are you going to

pay. I get three years of city budgets. And it amazes me that the ending balance one year does not match the beginning balance the next year. The numbers need to be accurate. I would like to see a draft or unaudited numbers

Mr. Koppert – There is one thing about the report that concerns me with regards to giving it to the legislature and I understand that it is mandated that they see it all. When they get it on January 1, they are going to be looking at data at a minimum that is a year and a half old. They are not looking at what took place this fiscal year and what is going to be taking place July 1 and on. They are not looking at a bunch of CPE equipment upgrades and things like that that took place this year. That component is going to be missing. I don't know how to get the information across to them but that's something that is a big hole in this report. They are seeing stuff that is a year and a half old.

Mr. Seivert – Isn't the data one part of the report and there is an interpretation of that data included as well?

Mr. DeRouchey – We are still having internal discussions. The law tasks us with the adequacy of the \$1.00. Too much, not enough or just right. To your point Rob, along those same lines, that is why I pointed out that you will not be seeing the 58% on the pass through until October.

Interoperability Governance Board – Iowa Statewide Interoperable Communications System Board (ISICSB) – Craig Allen

I attended the National Council SWICs in Florida. Issues that were discussed were interoperability, LTE and encryption. The use of encryption in an interoperable mode. Placing that sort of information in CASM.

I attended the International Association of Law Enforcement Information Managers. There was discussion about body cameras. Our side of it is now we have this information, where does it go to, who gets what information and how.

Public Safety Communications Research Group located in Boulder, CO. They held a conference and I attended. The big focus was on broadband. Discussion about across voice and data. Today LTE is not ready for push to talk radio. Europe will be on the leading edge on beta testing of this technology.

FirstNet – We have finished the outreach phase to all 99 counties. Round one of data collection has been satisfied.

We have partnered with the Iowa National Guard to conduct COMEX exercises. First one was in April at Davenport and the second one will be October 16<sup>th</sup> at Camp Dodge.

The board will be reviewing today a draft definition of public safety grade. From conversation across the country public safety grade seem to be just associated with broadband LTE. The real question is what is a public safety grade piece of equipment versus a non-public safety grade piece of equipment. There are several aspect to this.

Yesterday was day one of the SCIP (Statewide Communications Interoperable Plan) review. This continues today.

Mr. Dehnert – Back to the Program Manager – The interruption of the data in this report from the PSAPs, did GeoComm get retained for that?

Mr. DeRouchey – We did have a webinar with them just so they could see what we wanted. It didn't really fit their business model of what they wanted to do. We went down that road with LR Kimball then and they are still kind of on hold as we try to figure out what we want out of the data. If we take the minimalist approach as to what the legislation asks, we can write it ourselves. If we need advanced analytics, a contractor will do that.

Mr. Bryant asked for a clarification on the actual wireless carryover balance.

Mr. DeRouchey stated it is the \$24.7 million.

Mr. Bryant – What do we project, assuming everyone applies for the grant(s) and the obligated funds as set aside, what is this going to look like a year from now.

Mr. DeRouchey – John and I put some of those numbers together. Our goal is to maintain at the minimum \$3 to \$4 million in carryover funds in case of an emergency. I project \$100,000 for the wireless carryover grant this year and next year plus GIS carryover grant allotment which is an extra \$15,000 per PSAP. We can't maintain that for two years. As we get more real numbers we may have to look at decreasing the carryover fund at this time next year to maintain that \$3 to \$4 million balance.

Mr. Bryant – We have to take \$4 million for the first year payment for the 700 MHz radio system.

Mr. DeRouchey – Putting in the 25% incentive. Two PSAPs are heavily leaning toward consolidating. Those numbers are an estimate.

Mr. Benson – If you look at the numbers it is to run the carryover at \$100,000 for next two years. That is our goal. Based on what we know, we will not be able to maintain that. Simple fact of the matter is now there's more money going out and there will be less money going into the carryover fund. So we are going to try and keep it as long as we can. If we were to jack it up this year, it would be one year and you would be done.

Mr. Bryant – One of the conversations I heard is one of the problems with the carryover fund is they have already certified the budget...particularly when there was a match. It was any project over \$100,000 and they couldn't use it and being able to use it with a different definition will help this. They certify the budget in March and don't know what the carryover is going to be. From what I got there was a need for more knowledge and planning ability in the future.

Mrs. Hall – We discussed this yesterday because of the cost recovery for the wireless carriers. That was reduced from 13% to 10% but they don't begin to use that amount. Was that taken into consideration because what they do not use will be going back into the carryover?

Mr. DeRouchey – At 13% you could estimate \$3.6 million going out of the fund per year. In our estimates we've been factoring in the average that has been expended and that is \$560,000 a year.

Mr. Koppert – We heard earlier this year that not all PSAPs applied for this money. Based on your findings how many PSAPs have applied for this year? Can you expect 100% next year?

Mr. DeRouchey – The actual dollar amount as of last night was \$10.2 million expended or obligated. So when you do the math that is pretty close to 115 requesting but there is \$3 million of that that hasn't been claimed yet. I think opening up the receipt and disposition piece helps and the GIS piece that we are pushing hard to do should be \$15,000 for every service board to do that.

Mr. Koppert – So \$10.2 million that would be 102 PSAPs there's 117 so there's 15 that didn't or \$1.5 million roughly.

Mr. DeRouchey – They didn't or some applied for a portion of the \$100,000. I haven't counted how many service boards didn't apply.

Mr. Seivert – Maybe we can get a map and detailed what each county used of that wireless surcharge and have that available for the council's next meeting.

Mr. DeRouchey – In this year's legislative report we did do a map of the counties that had applied up to that point.

Mr. Seivert – If you could send that out we could see which of our neighbors isn't using it and help them to better understand how to use that money. We didn't factor in anything for the ongoing 700 MHz radio system did we?

Mr. Benson – No.

Mr. Seivert – Because it just seems a little confusing John when we are working with the numbers factoring in that long term commitment that there was money available moving forward.

Mr. Benson – With the ten year least in there the max we could support we have essentially killed off the carryover anyway. So now you have the 53% up to 58%. There is more money going out than before. The argument was that the locals wanted more money up front, well the back end slowly closes.

Mr. Seivert – Can you share that spreadsheet you worked off of?

Mr. Bryant – It helps me educate my legislators that I talk to, regardless of the two year study, I can tell them it's gone. I don't want to say things that are incorrect. Next legislative session is not that far away. There was another component to that amendment. The legislation struck the language that guarantee in the law that you would be able to have connectivity to the 700 MHz radio system for free. We have the director's email that Steven passed out to us that states the intent is to use it for free. That is part of what the equation was. When I went up to north central Iowa and attended their meeting I was like.....don't give away your money that you're going to need to do your part regardless. The state can give you half of what you need for free and use it for free but you still need another \$7.5 million to....they can build a foundation but if you don't have a roof to put on it, it is going to freeze and break. And I think because of the population of the county that they are considering the consolidation part. The majority of the counties can't afford to part because they are already under funded because there isn't enough surcharge coming back to the locals.

#### **Items for Discussion**

None

#### **Unfinished Business**

None

#### **New Business**

##### **Council Traveling for Meetings**

Mr. Bryant gave a brief history of the E911 Council and conducting their regular monthly meetings in other areas of the state. I think the biggest benefit of us meeting with the ISICS Board, same day same place, is probably more for the audience. Those people only have to come one time. I will say that I am very disturbed that we hold our meetings and the majority and I don't care if they come late, the majority of the ISICS members stand out there and don't come into the room. That was brought up yesterday during our workshop. Quite honestly it is disrespectful to me. I'm not saying that we need to move completely away but I did talk to a lot of people this legislative session. Those people in the far out areas do like us to come to their area. We used to do it three or four times a year. One month we would hold a planning session for the next year. I'm not saying we move but I think we should at least consider....I would like to talk about if we should go back out on the road a few times a year even if the ISICS Board is not. What I am understanding is they didn't see any more or even less participation. They aren't interested in going out but I think they have some regional things coming up that they are going to take their show in a different form than their meetings. When they setup these RICs.

Mr. Koppert – I think the outreach component is necessary that we need to be meeting with the service boards around the state but I question whether taking the whole board there is appropriate or if it's more appropriate....and I know this is done in other realms like emergency management. They will get representatives from the state to come to their meetings. Instead of us going to them, we should go to them but in to their meetings. For instance Pottawattamie County they have their 911 Service Board perhaps Bob or I since we are close, we attend their meeting and bring them up to date on the board. Get their take on what needs to be done and bring it back to the board. I see the individual board



meetings as they are held in Des Moines or wherever it seems to be that it's generally a higher percentage of the same people the same time. Whether they go here or there a lot of times it is usually the same people in the audience. You'll get some locals or course but I think we need to attend their meetings instead of asking them to attend ours. Dave could do stuff in his neck of the woods and Rob could do the stuff around Iowa County. I think that kind of outreach needs to be looked at as opposed to moving the meetings around.

Mr. Bryant – I think one of the reasons participation was different with the evening meeting was in the smaller city areas versus metro people were working and they are volunteers and are not going to be able to leave their job and come during the day. I'm not opposed to looking at that. Divide up 99 counties among the board members. Six to seven counties per board member. You may not be able to get to all seven every year but maybe make it a goal to get their once every two years.

Mr. Koppert – I'm not opposed to Mike's idea. Previously you traveled four times a year and that seemed to be a little bit much. I would narrow it down to maybe three or two times.

Mr. Bryant – A different quarter every time.

Mr. Seivert – I don't see why we can't do both. I don't think traveling four times a year is what we need. Maybe a couple of times. Having our meetings at a different location. Why doesn't somebody take the list of Iowa counties divide them among our 911 board members and make some assignments. Then as part of our committee reports we can take those initiatives and talk about them. Mr. Chair I make a proposal that we do that. The council members be assigned the various counties on a regional area basis. The council members make an effort to attend those local 911 service board meetings and bring the information back to the 911 Council and we travel a couple times a year.

Mr. Koppert – If you include the alternates in some of these as well, I think that would be appropriate as well. That should be some of their duties as an alternate. To do some outreach as well.

Mr. Bryant – Looking to the future, if we have....if some of those people just get a phone call from somebody. If that point of contact would get a phone call. I am going to guess they are going to be a lot more receptive down the road in a few months when we ask for help. When we try to do something or whatever it involves or to try and get their input or we find out those that didn't use their carryover funds.

Chair Ray – So Bob were you proposing....do you want....you're going to reach out to all the service boards. You're going to wait for them to hear about this and have them contact us if they want us to show up or are you just going to show up at their....whenever their meeting is.

Mr. Seivert – I think it would be up to the council members to contact those boards and say I have been assigned your county and would like to attend your meeting or if you have any questions feel free to contact me. An outreach like that.

Chair Ray – It is going to be a little more than six a piece because there are some on here that usually don't come to the meeting.

Mr. Kaus – Most alternates may not be abreast of what has been going on as they do not attend all of the meetings. Some of the alternates do.

Chair Ray – I don't have a problem if that's what you want to do. I will tell you that some of....any that would fall under me are probably going to get delegated out because I'm probably not going to have time to do this.

Sheriff Rotter – One of problems with the rural counties would be, they probably don't meet that often. We meet a lot around budget time. Myself sitting on several boards, it might be difficult to hit their budget season at the same time I'm hitting mine where I would be sacrificing my local budget meeting for someone else's. That would be my only concern especially in the rural counties that don't meet that often.

Mr. Johnson – What mechanism is there for rural PSAPs to submit questions/issues to these meetings?

Chair Ray – Yes, they can send a question to Blake or me or any member of the council.

Mr. Kaus – Blake is the point of contact for the council?

Chair Ray – He is but all of your names are on the website as members.

Mr. Kaus – I would say probably when they have questions they are in regards to Chapter 34A, or how to apply for a grant. I think they would feel more obligated to call Blake than any of us.

Mr. DeRouchey – Those are types of question I do receive. Can we do this or can we do that?

Mr. Bryant – If we weren't going to attend, the board could do a phone call. If there are ten of us that are willing to call ten counties.

Chair Ray – All of this is a good idea but the reality of it is there are some out there that don't actually care. I'm thinking you've got a little bit of money now for your outreach efforts and expense of the council. Maybe the first thing to do would be in some fashion we can make it known to all of the service boards in some mass letter that if you desire to have someone from the council to come and speak to you to let us know and we can coordinate amongst ourselves when those requests come up. Because I actually think trying to divide the counties among us, I don't see how that is going to work. Who is going to keep track of that? But if it was set more to the side "Hey, we are available, let us know" then we can coordinate among ourselves who is closer. That just seems like a more logical approach. I would entertain that motion if somebody would what to.....

Mr. Koppert made a motion that the council has on the road meetings no more than twice a year, spring and fall or whenever they chose to do that, and if members of the council either regular members or alternates want to outreach to service boards that they be allowed to do so. Whether it is a one to one or by phone. And we put out a message to each of the PSAPs, service board chairs and single point of contact for each county – that we are there, what we do and how we can help them. Motion was seconded by Johnson. All ayes. Motion passed.

Chair Ray – Maybe we will look at September for a travel meeting.

### **Travel Requests**

None

### **Business from the Floor / 911 Issues at the PSAPs**

Mr. Seivert – I am looking at a letter that I just got from my Sheriff. The chief jail inspector inspected our jail and he is telling our Sheriff that we need to train our dispatchers as jailers. Simply because we have a camera system. The primary is in the jail. The secondary is in the PSAP that is a backup for the jailers and just have the cameras there and then we control access to the doors into the buildings. We don't control access to the individual jail cells. I'll lose at least two dispatchers because of this. It is totally unreasonable. There has been a need to separate the jailers from the dispatchers for years and I know that some of our smaller counties, and the Sheriff will echo this, are not going to be happy. That concept of jailer/dispatcher is antiquated. It's outdated. It's conflicting. It is going to be a problem for our county.

Sheriff Rotter – You might look for some direction from the ISSDA's jail committee. Reach out to them and talk about this. It might be an issue where Delbert doesn't have a full understanding of what their role is. We deal with the same thing but our dispatchers do have access to the jail doors and do act as secondary jailers. I would definitely approach the jail committee and get some assistance in dealing with this.

Mr. Seivert – I know Spirit Lake had a big issue with it and if our dispatchers did go down into the jail and did matron duties that would be one thing.

Mr. Koppert – We had to go through the same thing. Our center was in the middle of the jail and Delbert said specifically because we open doors, now we don't open them autonomously; we open them at the direction of the jailer. We still needed to be jailers and that created a huge issue with us as well.

Sheriff Rotter – We came from that so it was not a huge adjustment for us. Our dispatch center looked at trying to going away from that and we were told no. But we do change out. We do open doors. We do help in the direction of the jail. It makes sense for us. But for you, I question some of that.

**Announcements**

Next meeting date – Wednesday, July 8<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 a.m. in the West Des Moines City Council Chambers. Day two of the SCIP review will be at DMACC starting at 2:00 p.m. today.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Ray adjourned the meeting at 10:33 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Hall, Secretary